

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 29, 2007. Claims 1 to 24 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 13, 14 and 16 to 18 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The specification was objected for including hyperlinks. The specification has been amended to address the points noted in the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,826,597 (Lonnroth). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns sending a service description document that describes service features by a server that provides the service to a client computer. In the invention, the service description document describes preprocessing or post-processing functionalities that may be implemented during execution of the service.

Referring specifically to the claims, Claim 1 is directed to a method of offering a service provided by a server computer in a communication network, comprising sending, from the server computer that provides the service to a client computer, a service description document describing a service, the document comprising a description of a functionality implemented during a preprocessing or post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network.

Claim 13 is directed to a method of testing access to a service by a client

computer in a communication network, from a service description document, comprising the following steps implemented by the client computer, extracting a description of a functionality implemented during a preprocessing or a post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network, reading a value associated with a property adapted to specify a node in the communication network adapted to execute the processing, reading a value of a property adapted to specify whether the processing is obligatory or optional, and verifying whether the processing is supported by the client computer in the communication network when the processing is obligatory and must be executed by the client computer in the communication network.

Claim 14 is directed to a method of validating a message received by an intermediate computer in a communication network, from a service description document comprising a description of a functionality implemented during a preprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of the message exchanged during the execution of a service on the communication network, comprising the following steps, extracting a processing from the received message, acquiring from the service description document at least one imperative value associated with a property of the processing, and verifying whether the imperative value is included in a list of values which can be attributed to a property supported by the functionality described in the service description document.

Claims 16 to 18 are device claims that substantially correspond to Claims 1, 13 and 14, respectively.

The applied art of Lonnroth is not seen to teach the features of the invention, and in particular, with regard to Claim 1, is not seen to teach the features of

sending, from the server computer that provides the service to a client computer, a service description document describing a service, the document comprising a description of a functionality implemented during a preprocessing or post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network.

Lonnroth is seen to disclose the exchange of messages processed by clients to services, the messages being sent to pre-processors before reaching the service. Thus, the pre-processors read the messages and process it to generate a new message that the service can understand. The Office Action cited column 4, lines 32 to 36 of Lonnroth as allegedly teaching the features of Claim 1. However, in the cited portion of Lonnroth, the client is the one sending a request identifying a service and including a number of parameters. On the contrary, with the invention, the server that provides the service sends a service description document to the client. Thus, Claims 1 and 16, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are not believed to be anticipated by Lonnroth.

Regarding Claims 13 and 17, Lonnroth is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of extracting a description of a functionality implemented during a preprocessing or a post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the communication network, and verifying whether processing is supported by the client computer in the communication network when processing is obligatory and must be executed by the client computer in the communication network.

In Lonnroth, when messages are sent from the client to the service, the service can check the validity of the message and whether it should be processed. This is

in contrast to the invention of Claims 13 and 17 in which the client, and not the service, tests whether it will be able to interact correctly with the service. Thus, Claims 13 and 17, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are not believed to be anticipated by Lonroth.

As for Claims 14 and 18, Lonroth is not seen to teach the features of acquiring from a service description document at least one imperative value associated with a property of processing, and verifying whether the imperative value is included in a list of values which can be attributed to a property supported by the functionality described in the service description document. Accordingly, Claims 14 and 18, as well as the claims dependent therefrom are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 1995500v1